OIPE IAP45 JAN 06 2006 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 054358-5025

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| In re Application of: | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Kyeong Jin KIM, *et al.* | ) | Confirmation No.: 4675 |
| | ) | |
| Application No.: 10/802,772 | ) | Group Art Unit: 2871 |
| | ) | |
| Filed: March 18, 2004 | ) | Examiner: T. Duong |
| | ) | |
| For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE USING DUAL LIGHT UNIT AND METHOD OF FABRICATING THE SAME | ) | |

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

## RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIE REQUIREMENT

In response to the Election of Specie Requirement mailed by the Office Action on December 6, 2005, Applicants hereby provisionally elect Specie A, sub-Specie A1, claims 5 and 27, *with traverse.*

Applicants confirm the Examiner's indication that claims 1-4, 7-26, and 29-44 are generic to each of alleged Species A, B, and C. Accordingly, as stated in the Requirement, upon allowance of generic claims 1-4, 7-26, and 29-44, claims 6 and 28 will be entitled to consideration, as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141.

Applicants respectfully assert traverse the Requirement on grounds that the subject matter of claims 5, 6, 27, and 28 is sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter for any one species would necessarily encompass a search or the subject matter of the remaining Species. Further it is submitted that the total number of alleged species is not an unreasonable number of species to examine. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be performed without serious burden. M.P.E.P. § 803 clearly states that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes two distinct or independent inventions." It is respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the preset application in order to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to the Applicants and duplicative examination by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the election of species requirement and to examine all claims in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: January 6, 2005

By: _____
David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

**Customer No. 009629**
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000